

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 453 468

CG 030 947

AUTHOR Ronas, Andrea; Berkson, Nancy; Goh, David
TITLE Job Activities of the School Psychologist in Inclusive Educational Settings.
PUB DATE 2001-04-00
NOTE 29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists (Washington, DC, April 17-21, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Evaluation; *Inclusive Schools; *Performance Based Assessment; *Professional Services; Regular and Special Education Relationship; *Role; *School Counselors; *School Psychologists
IDENTIFIERS New York (Long Island)

ABSTRACT

A sample of 122 school psychologists on Long Island were surveyed to explore the relationship between the degree of inclusion in their schools and the amount of time they spent engaged in performing activities identified as facilitating inclusion and in completing one activity identified as a traditional assessment. The results concurred with past research showing that assessment was how school psychologists spent a large amount of their time. Although school psychologists were frequently involved in behavioral and academic consultation, they were much less involved in other activities believed to facilitate inclusion, such as modifying curriculum; conducting inservice training; assisting in planning system-wide changes; and conducting program evaluation. The degree of inclusion in a school did not show a significant effect on the type of job activities performed by the school psychologist in that school. Implications for role changes in inclusion for school psychologists are discussed. (Contains 1 appendix, 3 tables, and 13 references.) (JDM)

Running head: JOB ACTIVITIES OF THE SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST

Job Activities of the School Psychologist in Inclusive Educational Settings

Andrea Ronas, Nancy Berkson, David Goh

Queens College, City University of New York

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

A. Ronas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of School Psychologists, Washington, D.C., 2001.

Abstract

A sample of 122 school psychologists on Long Island were randomly mailed a survey exploring the relationship between the degree of inclusion in their school and the amount of time they spent engaged in performing 21 activities thought to facilitate inclusion and 1 activity identified as traditional assessment. Descriptive statistics were computed on the 72 usable surveys returned. Results reflected that as in past research, assessment was still an activity in which school psychologists spent a large amount of their time. While a majority of the psychologists were also involved frequently in behavioral and academic consultation, they were much less involved in other activities believed to facilitate inclusion, such as modifying curriculum, conducting inservice training, assisting in planning system-wide changes, conducting program evaluation and research. Furthermore, degree of inclusion in a school did not show a significant effect on the type of job activities performed by the school psychologist in that school. Implications for role changes of the school psychologist in inclusive education are discussed.

Job Activities of the School Psychologist in Inclusive Educational Settings

The movement towards inclusion, defined as the education of disabled children within the regular education classroom has increased steadily throughout the 1990's. Malarz (1996) states that an inclusive school would allow all students to receive the services they require within a regular education classroom. A 1994 policy update of the National Association of State Boards of Education as discussed by Malarz, further explains that inclusion must not involve placing disabled students into a regular class for the sake of integration without the proper supports and services. In addition, general education teachers cannot be expected to teach disabled children within the regular classroom without adequate support. A number of studies have been conducted exploring the types of support necessary for general education teachers to effectively implement inclusion (e. g., Scott, Vitale, & Masten, 1998; Werts, Wolery, Snyder, Caldwell, & Salisbury, 1996; Wilson, Gutkin, Hagen, & Oats, 1998). Among the major supportive needs found in these studies were: Inservice training both at the onset of and throughout the school year; opportunities to observe other teachers and to attend conferences; consultation with specialists on instructional; behavioral and curricular interventions and modifications; release time for consultation; and greater assistance in the classroom especially for teachers with significantly disabled children within their classes.

The shift in the education of disabled children from self-contained to inclusive classes, in the 1980's and 1990's led to a reexamination of the role of the school psychologist. There have been many articles written, urging a shift in the role of the school psychologist from the traditional one of testing and categorizing children, to one in which services known to support teachers (both regular and special education) and staff in facilitating inclusion were provided (Bradley-Johnson, Johnson, & Jacob-Timm, 1995; Reschly, 1988; Will, 1988; Wilson et al.,

1998). Both Assistant Secretary of the U.S. Office of Special Education Will (1988) and Reschly (1988) viewed the role of the school psychologist under the Regular Education Initiative, as shifting from that of "gatekeeper" involved in the classification of students, to one which involved the development and implementation of indirect services, including interventions. They described a shift in which school psychologists would provide supportive services to teachers. This would include the development of instructional and behavioral strategies, assessing the degree to which effective instruction is taking place, and improving the tools used to assess and diagnose a child's learning problems. Will proposed that school psychologists become more "proactive than reactive," (p. 478) meaning that they work towards the prevention of learning and instructional problems. This would require that a greater emphasis be placed on examining the environmental and instructional variables that may affect a child's learning. This includes activities such as classroom observations, analysis of curriculum task features, and participation in building-based support teams and providing inservice training to teachers.

Reschly (1988) also posited that because of the return of mildly learning disabled children, who make up the greatest majority of the classified students, to regular classes, significant changes in the role of the school psychologist would have to take place. He further proposed that the failure of school psychologists to make these role changes could ultimately lead to the decline of school psychology. In addition, Reschly stressed that new competencies needed to be developed in order for school psychologists to remain as the "... principal representative of the science and practice of psychology in the schools." (p.459). He described these new skills as involving behavioral and instructional consultation with teachers utilizing a problem -solving approach, rapport, empathy and problem clarification. Reschly (1988) stressed

that it was necessary for assessments of the future to be oriented to the natural setting in which children learn, the classroom. He felt that the contribution of the learning environment to the child's difficulties needed to be systematically explored. School psychologists, he argued, must reorient their skills to include the precise observation of behavior. Outcome criteria must be used to evaluate program effectiveness and usefulness of assessment procedures. The main emphasis of the school psychologist of the future will be on designing and implementing effective interventions and in assisting others in doing so (Reschly, 1988).

Seven years after the writings of Will (1988) and Reschly (1988), articles about the appropriate changes in the role of the school psychologist were still appearing. Bradley-Johnson et al. (1995) spoke of the "growing sense of urgency," (p.188) in light of the ongoing educational reform, for the school psychologist to shift from the primary role of gatekeeper to that of providing all of the other activities enumerated in the recent literature. Their article was a self-labeled call to action, one meant to get school psychologists to reevaluate their roles and increase and update their skills if necessary. In addition to the emphasis Bradley-Johnson et al., (1995) placed on the systematic design of interventions, consultative services to teachers, and classroom observations with the goals of ecological assessments, they stressed the need for the school psychologist to become more of a scientist. The school psychologist must keep current on all relevant research, they argued, so that their interventions are empirically based. They should use their expertise in systematic data collection and analysis to design investigations on the effectiveness of school programs for all children.

Others in the profession have described forces they see as serving as barriers in preventing school psychologists from making these role changes. Kovalski (1988) posited that the school psychologists' role would not shift until the philosophy of the system that reinforced

their behavior also changed. He proposed that the current dual system of education although slowly shifting, still supported the traditional roles of the school psychologist. Special educators believed their classes were the best place for disabled children, while at the same time, many general education teachers believed they did not possess the ability to teach these children within their classes. Thus he argued, both groups of teachers pressured the school psychologist to assess and place children in special education, and rewarded them for doing so. Kovalski (1988) further stated that school psychologists must be actively involved in attempting to change teachers' perceptions that learning problems resided only within the child. He felt there were a number of steps school psychologists could take to do this. They included helping regular education teachers feel more confident by providing inservice courses on effective teaching procedures, participating in curriculum committees, incorporating discussions of effective classroom approaches and environmental variables in pre-referral activities and in their psychological reports, and developing preventive and therapeutic programs for all students. Kovalski stressed that school psychologists should be viewed not only as evaluators of individual children but analysts of the educational system as a whole. Until these changes in the role of the school psychologist were made, Kovalski did not hold much optimism for changes in the system occurring. Conoley and Gutkin (1995) also presented reasons why they felt the school psychologist's role had yet to change. They argued that in order for such changes to occur, school psychologists must focus more on how to bring about organizational changes, rather than individual ones. School psychology training programs must spend greater amounts of time teaching organizational development, social psychology, social influence and topics supportive of systems change. They felt it was necessary for school psychologists to understand and influence competing forces in the educational system at all levels to be effective. Without

this knowledge, they stated, school psychologists will not be effective in bringing about change. In addition, they must find ways to deal with the pressure to assess children in their settings while making the time to act as role models for the other professionals.

A review of the literature has clearly produced implications for role changes of the school psychologist under an inclusive model of education. As we reach the end of a decade that has witnessed a tremendous push to educate disabled children in the least restrictive environment, there is a need for research to explore whether in fact the role of the school psychologist has changed as proposed, as changes in education have occurred. If not, the reason for this must be understood and analyzed. The purpose of this study was to investigate 1) the extent to which inclusion has been implemented in schools, 2) job-related activities of the school psychologist in inclusive education, and 3) whether the implementation of inclusion had an effect on the specific job-related activities, which make up the role of the school psychologist working within a school. It was further hypothesized that as the degree of inclusive services increased within a school, the school psychologist spent a greater proportion of the time involved in activities believed to facilitate inclusion.

Method

Participants

A total of 122 school psychologists currently working in elementary schools in Nassau and Suffolk Counties on Long Island were surveyed for this research. The participants were selected by stratified random sampling of elementary schools from all school districts in these two counties as listed in the Directory of Public Schools and Administrators in New York State, 1998-1999 edition. Surveys were mailed to the attention of the school psychologist in each school. The mailings resulted in the return of 75 surveys, or approximately 61%. Three surveys

were unusable. One, because it had not been completed by the psychologist, who noted there were only 14 students within this unique school. Another, because the psychologist indicated they worked in a residential treatment center for 100 % special education children, and a third because it was returned eight weeks after the deadline. This yielded a usable sample of 72 surveys, approximately 59 % of the total 122 surveys mailed. Of this usable group, 45 respondents were female (62.5%) and 27 were male (37.5%). The ages of the respondents were as follows: 10 respondents (13.9%) fell between 20 to 30 years of age; 23 respondents (31.9%) fell between 30 to 40 years of age; 19 respondents (26.4%) fell between 40 to 50 years of age; 17 respondents (23.6%) fell between 50 to 60 years of age; and 3 respondents (4.2%) were over the age of 60. The highest level of education obtained by the respondents were as follows: 34 respondents (47.2%) had received Ph.D.'s; 7 respondents (9.7%) had received Psy.D's; 16 respondents (22.2%) had Certificate/Specialist level degrees; and 15 respondents (20.8%) of the sample had received Masters as their highest level of degree. The number of years working as a school psychologist were as follows: 12 respondents (16.7%) had worked as a school psychologist for less than five years; 16 respondents (22.2%) had worked for five to ten years; 17 respondents (23.6%) had worked for 10 to 15 years; seven respondents (9.7%) had worked for 15 to 20 years; and 20 respondents (27.8%) had worked as a school psychologist for over 20 years.

Instrument

The survey instrument, the School Psychologist-Degree of Inclusion Interaction Scale (SP-DIIS) was designed specifically for use in the present study (Appendix A). The questionnaire consisted of both closed and partially open-ended questions. The first section included questions assessing demographic characteristics of the school psychologist. The second section included questions designed to collect school information, both demographics and the

degree of inclusive services within the school. The third section consisted of restricted questions requiring the psychologist to indicate the amount of time spent performing 22 specific school psychological activities, based upon a key provided. The activity items were developed through a systematic review of both empirical and theoretical literature and included both job activities traditionally performed by the school psychologists, as well as those believed to facilitate inclusion (Bradley-Johnson et al., 1995; Reschly, 1988; Will, 1988). The activities were listed as:

- 1) Assessment of children, using standardized norm-referenced tests for eligibility and classification determination;
- 2) Curriculum- based assessments of children for the purpose of diagnosis and instructional design;
- 3) Classroom observations of children to identify environmental variables which may be contributing to their learning/ behavioral difficulties;
- 4) Systematic classroom observation and data recording for design of behavioral plans;
- 5) Design of academic interventions;
- 6) Design of behavioral interventions;
- 7) Modification of curriculum materials;
- 8) Consultation with teachers to develop academic interventions;
- 9) Consultation with teachers to develop behavioral interventions;
- 10) Assisting teachers in implementing academic interventions;
- 11) Assisting teachers in implementing behavioral interventions;
- 12) Conducting evaluations on the effectiveness of your interventions;
- 13) Participation in a building based multi-disciplinary support team to identify children experiencing learning/ behavioral problems and design of prereferral interventions;
- 14) Conducting in-service training workshops for teachers in areas such as understanding different learning styles, strategies, modification of instructional materials, special education laws, etc.;
- 15) Conducting workshops for auxiliary staff such as cafeteria personnel, bus drivers or custodians on working with special needs children;
- 16) Individual or group counseling of students;
- 17) Design of program evaluation procedures;
- 18) Review of current research on new instructional methods, techniques etc.;
- 19) Conducting

research on the efficacy of new instructional approaches to meet the needs of children within the regular class; 20) Involved in planning/organizing system-wide changes in the way in which the unique needs of children are being met within the regular class; 21) Conducting parent workshops or programs with the goal of facilitating academic achievement; 22) Attending workshops on new instructional strategies, interventions, etc.

The respondents were asked to use the following key to indicate the number that most closely reflected their degree of involvement in each of the above activities for the 1999-2000 school year: 1=Never, 2=Rarely (One to three times since school year's inception), 3=Sometimes (About once or twice a month), 4=Often (About once or twice a week), 5=Very Often (More than three times a week).

Procedure

The surveys were mailed to all participants during the first week of March 2000. It was requested that the survey be completed and returned within two weeks. Included with the survey was a postage-paid, self-addressed return envelope. As a small token of appreciation for their participation, a brightly colored blue pen embossed with the words "School Psychology" and a "smiley face" accompanied the survey.

Results

First, descriptive statistics on relevant school information was obtained. The results revealed that 24 (33.3%) of the elementary schools for which data was obtained had 0 to 500 students enrolled, 43 (59.7%) had 500 to 1,000 students enrolled, and 5 (6.9%) had over 1,000 students enrolled. An analysis of the ethnic make-up of students within the schools reflected the following percentage distribution: Caucasian (78%); African American (11%); Latino (7%), and Asian American (2.5%). Next, information regarding the children eligible to receive special

education services and the special education practices in the school were analyzed. In terms of percentage of children eligible to receive special education services in each of the schools, six respondents (8.3%) indicated that 0 to 5% of students in their school were classified as eligible to receive special education services; 39 respondents (54.2%) indicated that 5 to 10% were eligible; 10 respondents (13.9%) indicated that 10 to 15% were eligible; 16 respondents (22.2%) indicated that 15-20% were eligible, and one respondent (1.4%) indicated that over 20% of all students in the school were eligible. Data analysis on the setting(s) in which students with disabilities were currently receiving their education within the school indicated that 26% of all classified students were reported as being educated within a regular education classroom only, 50.1% were reported as receiving their education in a combination of a regular class and a resource room, 18.2% were reported as being educated in a self-contained classroom, and 5.6% as being educated in “other settings.”

A review of items indicating the types of disabilities that might be found within an inclusion class (regular education classroom in which special education students are educated), revealed that 4 respondents (5.6%) indicated that no classified children were educated within a regular education classroom, and 68 (94.4%) indicated that disabled children were found within regular education classes in their school. Of the classified children who are serviced within an inclusion classroom, the following categories of disabilities were reported: Learning Disabilities (91.4% of the respondents); Speech/Language Impairment (88.6%); Emotional Disturbance (55.7%); Multiply Handicapped (48.6%); Orthopedically Handicapped (40%); Autistic (33.3%); Mild Mental Retardation (32.9%); and Moderate-severe Mental Retardation (24.3%). An “Other” category identified by 11 respondents reflected Other Health Impaired, especially ADHD, consisting of 15%, and Hearing-Impaired 4.2%.

The surveys also provided data on who taught the inclusion classes within the respondents' schools. About 55.6% of the respondents reported that inclusion classes might be taught by a regular education teacher only, 41.7% indicated that inclusion classes might be co-taught by a regular education and a special education teacher, 51.4% indicated that inclusion classes in their school might be taught by a regular education teacher with a consulting special education teacher, and 46.5% indicated that inclusion classes might be taught by a regular education teacher with one or more assistants. Thus some schools had more than one inclusive model being utilized.

Means and standards deviations of the frequency ratings of the 22 job related activities performed by the school psychologists are displayed in Table 1. The ratings ranged between 4.22 (most frequent) and 1.31 (least frequent) on a five-point scale. Three activities – individual/group counseling, assessment, and participating in support teams– received the highest frequency rating (4 or higher). On the other hand, five activities – program evaluation, in-service for teachers, parent workshops, research, and workshop for auxiliary staff – received the lowest ratings (all below 2). Table 2 shows the percentages of the total respondents who performed each of these activities within each of the five rating categories (Never through Very Often).

Analyses were then performed to determine whether the degree of inclusion in a school has an effect on the types of job activities in which the respondents engaged. Degree of inclusion was defined by the extent of inclusive education provided to children with classified disabilities in a school: Inclusion class only, a combination of inclusion class and resource room, or a self-contained class only. A single factor MANOVA revealed a significant overall effect due to degree of inclusion on the 22 job activities, $F(69, 132) = 12.96, p < .0001$. Univariate ANOVAs

found significant group differences on two of the 22 job related activities: conducting classroom observations, $F(2, 68) = 4.72, p < .05$, and conducting parent workshops, $F(2, 68) = 3.21, p < .05$. Post-hoc tests via Scheffe detected the following significant pairwise differences on these two activities: For conducting classroom observations, the mean for the self-contained only group (4.20) was significantly higher than the mean for the inclusion class and resource room combination group (3.53); and for conducting parent workshops, the mean for the self-contained only group (2.30) was significantly higher than the mean for the inclusion class and resource room combination group (1.60). No other significant differences were found on the remaining 20 job related activities. As part of the analysis, we also organized the 22 job related activities into five clusters, each subsuming a number of activities of the same nature. The five clusters were assessment, intervention, consultation, training, and professional development. Means and standard deviations of these clusters are displayed in Table 3. A single factor MANOVA did not reveal a significant effect due to degree of inclusion on the five job activity clusters, $F(10, 124) = 1.22, p > .05$.

In order to examine the relationship between the degree of inclusion within the school and the job-related activities performed by school psychologists thought to facilitate inclusion, a combined variable called “inclusion facilitator” was created. This variable was computed by summing the ratings provided by each respondent for activities #2 through #22. The mean and SD for “inclusion facilitator” for the total sample were 2.74 and .39, respectively. The means and SDs (in parenthesis) for the three settings with varying degrees of inclusion were: Inclusion class only, 2.71 (.42); inclusion class and resource room combination, 2.71 (.38), and self-contained class only, 2.95 (.36). A one-way ANOVA revealed no significant group effect on this “inclusion facilitator” variable, $F(2,66) = 1.63, p > .05$. Since activity #1, assessment, was not

included in the computation of “inclusion facilitator” and assessment is traditionally an activity in which school psychologists spend the majority of their time, a one-way ANOVA was also used to analyze data on this major activity. The means and SDs of the frequency ratings were: Inclusion class only, $M = 4.22$, $SD = .88$; inclusion class and resource room combination, $M = 3.95$, $SD = .79$; and self-contained class only, $M = 4.40$, $SD = .70$. No significant group differences were found, $F(2, 68) = 1.63$, $p > .05$.

Discussion

The present results indicate that a majority of the schools surveyed have implemented inclusion, although to varying extents. Over 75% of all children classified as eligible to receive special education in the surveyed schools were spending all or the majority of their days in a regular education class. The data showed that a wide range of disabilities, both in type and degree of severity, were found among classified children within the regular classroom. The combination of a regular class and a resource room was the most common mode of service delivery, with about 50% of all classified children receiving their education in such a setting. Less than 24% of children with disabilities were being educated in self-contained settings.

The findings on job related activities of the present sample of school psychologists surveyed would appear to confirm past studies with respect to assessment activities. In previous surveys (e.g., Benson & Hughes, 1985; Cook & Patterson, 1977; Goh, Teslow & Fuller, 1981; Lacayo, Morris, & Sherwood, 1981), school psychologists reported spending their greatest percentage of time (about 40-50%) involved in the assessment of students for eligibility and classification purposes. In the current survey, assessment of students utilizing standardized norm-referenced tests for eligibility and classification purposes had the second greatest mean of

the activities measured 4.08. Over 75% of all respondents indicated that they were involved in this activity often or very often. Only individual and/or group counseling had a higher mean, 4.22. A review of the results of the activities thought to facilitate inclusion indicate that many of these activities are in fact being performed on a regular basis by a majority of the school psychologists surveyed. Over 50% of the school psychologists reported that they are involved in consultation with teachers for academic and/or behavioral interventions at least several times a week. Likewise, 85% of all psychologists surveyed are meeting with support teams several times a week to design prereferral interventions.

However, school psychologists do not engage as frequently in other activities felt to facilitate inclusion. For example, since the school year's inception, more than 50% of all psychologists surveyed had never, or rarely been involved in modifying curriculum materials, an area in which teachers expressed a desire for help (Scott et al., 1988; Wilson et al., 1998), reviewed current research on new instructional methods, performed curriculum-based assessments, or been involved in planning/organizing system-wide changes in the way in which the unique needs of children can be met within the regular education class. A large number of psychologists, in conflict with Bradley-Johnson's et al., (1995) call for the school psychologist to assume more of a role of a scientist and measurement expert, reported having had no involvement with the following activities since the years inception: 66% reported never conducting research; and only 4.2% had indicated that they were involved in conducting research once or twice a month. The activity performed the least, with a mean of 1.31 was conducting workshops for auxiliary staff such as cafeteria personnel, bus drivers or custodians pertaining to working with special needs children. Over 72% of all psychologists reported they had not conducted such a workshop since the school year's inception.

In terms of the effects of inclusion on job activities performed by the school psychologists, only a few statistically significant findings were obtained. Specifically, school psychologists engaged in two of the activities - conducting classroom observations, and conducting parent workshops – slightly more often when students with disabilities were educated in a self-contained classroom than in a combination of regular class and resource room. No significant findings were found on the other 20 job related activities. Generally speaking, as the degree of inclusive services increases within a school, the school psychologist did not spend a greater proportion of the time involved in activities thought to facilitate inclusion. This finding is noteworthy in light of the fact that many of the inclusion classes surveyed in the present study were taught by regular education teachers only. Based on past research (Werts et al., 1996; Wilson et al., 1998), one would reasonably assume that the teachers of inclusion classes would seek much consultation, assistance with curriculum and material modification and teaching of special needs children. These results seem to indicate that although many of the surveyed school psychologists were performing some activities that were believed to facilitate inclusion, these activities did not reflect a role change pertinent to inclusive settings for the school psychologist. For example, the present study did not find a setting effect (degree of inclusion) on consultation, an activity performed often by many school psychologists. In addition, few psychologists were involved on a regular basis in modifying curriculum, assisting in planning system-wide changes, training auxiliary personnel to work effectively with special needs children, and reviewing and conducting research.

Finally, it should be noted that the present results are based on a small sample of psychologists working in elementary schools on Long Island. Caution should be exercised in

interpreting the findings as well as in generalizing them to other settings. Cross validation of these results is needed from future studies with larger and more representative samples. Nevertheless, consistent with past research (Conoley & Gutkin, 1995; Kovalesski, 1988), the present data also suggest that substantive role changes of the school psychologist as advocated by leaders in the field (e.g., Reschly, 1988; Will, 1988) in response to the inclusive education movement, have yet to take place. It is also important for school psychologists to be aware of the kinds of activities that are believed to facilitate the successful integration of disabled children within the regular education classroom, and for that matter, the school system as a whole. It is possible that psychologists are not able to engage in these activities due to limitations of their time and other traditional job responsibilities. It is also possible that psychologists are not willing to engage in these job activities, or do not have sufficient competence in this area to do so. School psychologists may wish to examine whether these are activities that they may wish to incorporate within their own schools. They may also wish to examine possible barriers preventing them from engaging in these activities and pursue solutions accordingly. As inclusion continues to be a reality within the majority of schools, school psychologists must continue to explore how they can best meet the needs of the children and other professionals within the school.

References

- Benson, A.J., & Hughes, J. (1985). Perceptions of role definition processes school psychology: A national survey. School Psychology Review, 14 (1), 64-74.
- Bradley-Johnson, S., Johnson, C.M., & Jacob-Timm, S. (1995). Where will-and where should-changes in education leave school psychology? Journal of School Psychology, 33 (3), 187-200.
- Conoley, J.C. & Gutkin, T. B. (1995). Why didn't-why doesn't- school psychology realize its promise? Journal of School Psychology, 33 (3), 209-217.
- Cook, V.J. & Patterson, J. G. (1977). Psychologists in the schools of Nebraska: Professional functions. Psychology in the Schools, 14, 371-376.
- Goh, D. S., Teslow, C., & Fuller, G. B. (1981). The practice of psychological assessment among school psychologists. Professional Psychology, 12, 696-706.
- Kovaleski, J.F. (1988). Paradigmatic obstacles to reform in school psychology. School Psychology Review, 17 (3), 479-484.
- Lacayo, N., Morris, J. & Sherwood, G. (1981). Daily activities of school psychologists: A national survey.
- Malarz, L. (1996). Using staff development to create inclusive schools. Journal of Staff Development, 17 (3), 8-11.
- Reschly, D.J. (1988). Special education reform: School psychology revolution. School Psychology Review, 17 (3), 459-475.

Scott, B.J., Vitale, M.R., & Masten, W.G. (1998). Implementing instructional adaptations for students with disabilities in inclusive classrooms. Remedial and Special Education, 19 (2) 102-111.

Werts, M.G., Wolery, M. Snyder, E. D., Caldwell, N.K., & Salisbury, C. L. (1996). Supports and resources associated with inclusive schooling: Perceptions of elementary school teachers about need and availability. The Journal of Special Education, 30 (2), 187-203.

Will, M., (1988). Educating students with learning problems and the changing role of the school psychologist. School Psychology Review, 17 (3), 476-478.

Wilson, C.P., Gutkin, T.B., Hagen, K.M. & Oats, R.G. (1998). General education teachers' knowledge and self-reported use of classroom interventions for working with difficult-to teach students: Implications for consultation, prereferral intervention and inclusive services. School Psychology Quarterly, 13, (1), 45-62.

Appendix A

SCHOOL PSYCHOLOGIST/DEGREE OF INCLUSION INTERACTION SCALE**I. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION**

Please place a check in the space that applies to you.

1. Gender: ☐ Female ☐ Male
2. Age: ☐ 20-30 ☐ 30-40 ☐ 40-50 ☐ 50-60 ☐ Over 60
3. Highest level of education:
☐ Ph.D. ☐ Psy.D ☐ Certificate/Specialty Level ☐ M.A.
4. Your total number of years (including this year) working as school psychologist in **any** school.
☐ 0-5 ☐ 5-10 ☐ 10-15 ☐ 15-20 ☐ Over 20

II. SCHOOL INFORMATION

1. Total number of students attending the school. (Please check).
☐ 0-500 ☐ 500-1,000 ☐ Over 1,000
2. Approximate percent of students currently classified as eligible to receive special education services in the school.
0-5% ☐ 5-10% ☐ 10-15% ☐ 15-20% ☐ Over 20% ☐
3. What percentage of children classified as eligible to receive special education services are served in each of the following settings within your school?

Within a regular education class only (defined as an inclusion class) ☐ %
Within a regular education class and resource room ☐ %
Within a self-contained special education class only ☐ %
Other ☐ %
4. Approximate percent of students with each of the following backgrounds.
Caucasian ☐ % African-American ☐ % Hispanic ☐ %
Asian-American ☐ %
5. Indicate **each** of the types of disabilities that may be found within a regular education class (inclusion class) to which special education children in your school are assigned. Please check **all** that apply.
☐ no classified children within regular education classes
☐ learning disabled ☐ speech impaired
☐ emotionally disturbed ☐ orthopedically handicapped
☐ mildly mentally retarded ☐ multiply handicapped
☐ mod. to severely mentally retarded ☐ autistic

Other _____

6. Regular education classes in your school that include special education children are taught by: (Please check **all** that apply.)
- ☐ Regular education teacher only
☐ Co-taught by special education and regular education teacher
☐ Regular education teacher with a consulting special education teacher
☐ Regular education teacher with one or more assistants
☐ Other _____

III. PSYCHOLOGIST'S ACTIVITIES

Using the key below, please circle the number that most closely reflects your degree of involvement in the following activities for the 1999-2000 school year to date.

- 1= Never
 2= Rarely (One to three times since school year's inception)
 3= Sometimes (About once or twice a month)
 4= Often (About once or twice a week)
 5=Very Often (More than three times a week)

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Assessment of children, using standardized norm-referenced tests for eligibility and classification determination. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 2. Curriculum- based assessments of children for the purpose of diagnosis and instructional design. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 3. Classroom observations of children to identify environmental variables which may be contributing to their learning/ behavioral difficulties. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 4. Systematic classroom observation of children and data recording for design of behavioral plans. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 5. Design of academic interventions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 6. Design of behavioral interventions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 7. Modification of curriculum materials. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 8. Consultation with teachers to develop academic interventions. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

9. Consultation with teachers to develop behavioral interventions.
1 2 3 4 5
10. Assisting teachers in implementing academic interventions.
1 2 3 4 5
11. Assisting teachers in implementing behavioral interventions.
1 2 3 4 5
12. Conducting evaluations on the effectiveness of your interventions.
1 2 3 4 5
13. Participation in a building based multi-disciplinary support team to identify children experiencing learning/ behavioral problems and design of prereferral interventions.
1 2 3 4 5
14. Conducting in-service training workshops for teachers on areas such as understanding different learning styles, strategies, modification of instructional materials, special education laws, etc.
1 2 3 4 5
15. Conducting workshops for auxiliary staff such as cafeteria personnel, bus drivers or custodians on working with special needs children.
1 2 3 4 5
16. Individual or group counseling of students. 1 2 3 4 5
17. Design of program evaluation procedures. 1 2 3 4 5
18. Review of current research on new instructional methods, techniques etc.
1 2 3 4 5
19. Conducting research on efficacy of new instructional approaches to meet the needs of children within the regular class. 1 2 3 4 5
20. Involved in planning/organizing system -wide changes in the way in which the unique needs of children are being met within the regular class.
1 2 3 4 5
21. Conducting parent workshops or programs with the goal of facilitating academic achievement
1 2 3 4 5
22. Attending workshops on new instructional strategies, interventions, etc.
1 2 3 4 5
23. Other (Please specify)

	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5
	1	2	3	4	5

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations of Job Related Activities in Descending Order

Activity	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Individual/group counseling	72	4.22	.88
Assessment	72	4.08	.80
Support team	72	4.08	.64
Consultation/ behavioral interventions	72	3.93	.70
Class observations	72	3.69	.68
Assist/behavioral interventions	72	3.60	.87
Consultation/Academic intervention	72	3.54	.99
Design behavioral Interventions	72	3.51	.73
Systematic observation	70	3.04	.82
Design academic interventions	72	2.92	.93
Assist academic interventions	72	2.75	.99
Evaluate effectiveness of interventions	72	2.71	.85
Review research	72	2.44	.87
Modify curriculum	72	2.39	.85
Attend workshops	72	2.28	.75
System-wide changes	72	2.22	.92
Curriculum based assessment	72	2.21	1.06
Program evaluation	72	1.92	.90

Table 1 continued

Activity	<u>N</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
In-service for teachers	72	1.76	.66
Parent Workshops	72	1.75	.82
Conduct research	72	1.38	.57
Workshops for auxiliary staff	72	1.31	.52

Table 2

Percentages of Psychologists Who Perform Each Activity for each Rating Category

Activity	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
Individual/group counseling	1.4	2.8	12.5	38.9	44.4
Assessment	0	2.8	19.4	44.4	33.3
Support team	0	1.4	12.5	62.5	23.6
Consultation/behavioral interventions	0	0	27.8	51.4	20.8
Assist/behavioral interventions	0	11.1	31.9	43.1	13.9
Consultation/academic interventions	2.8	12.5	27.8	41.7	15.3
Design behavioral interventions	0	4.2	50.0	36.1	9.7
Systematic observations	2.8	18.1	52.8	19.4	4.2
Design academic interventions	5.6	25.0	47.2	16.7	5.6
Assist academic interventions	11.1	26.4	43.1	15.3	4.2
Evaluate effectiveness of interventions	8.3	29.2	45.8	16.7	0
Review research	12.5	43.1	31.9	12.5	0
Modify curriculum materials	16.7	34.7	41.7	6.9	0
Attend workshops	12.5	51.4	33.3	1.4	1.4

Table 2 continued

Activity	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Very Often
System-wide changes	22.2	43.1	26.4	6.9	1.4
Curriculum- based assessment	31.9	29.2	26.4	11.1	1.4
Program evaluation	40.3	30.6	27.8	0	1.4
In-service for teachers	33.3	59.7	4.2	2.8	0
Parent workshops	44.4	40.3	11.1	4.2	0
Conduct research	66.7	29.2	4.2	0	0
Workshops for auxiliary staff	72.2	25.0	2.8	0	0

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of the Five Job Activity Clusters

Category of Activities	N	M	SD
Assessment (4 activities)	70	3.24	.53
Intervention (3 activities)	72	2.94	.65
Consultation (7 activities)	72	3.19	.57
Training (2 activities)	72	1.54	.46
Professional Development (5 activities)	72	2.05	.49



U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: *School Psychologists' Job-Related Activities as a Function of Degree of Inclusion.*

Author(s): *Ronas, A., Berkson, N. & Goh, D.*

Corporate Source:

N/A

Publication Date:

under review

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Andrea S. Ronas

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: *Andrea S. Ronas M.S. NCSP*
Organization/Address: *Herbert G. Birch Early Childhood Center*

Printed Name/Position/Title: *Andrea S. Ronas M.S. NCSP.*

Telephone: *(516) 484-2636*

FAX: *—*

E-Mail Address: *aronas2@aol*

Date: *6/10/01*

NASP 2001

My home address:
48 Wickham Road
Roslyn Heights, N.Y. 11577

II. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse: ERIC Counseling and Student Services University of North Carolina at Greensboro 201 Ferguson Building, PO Box 26171 Greensboro, NC 27402-6171
--

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: <http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com>